

REMARKS

In the Final Office Action dated February 2, 2009, the Examiner has rejected claims 1, 5-23, 26, and 35-38 are under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being allegedly anticipated U.S. Patent No. 7,228,492 B1 (*Graham*). In addition, the Examiner has rejected claims 3, 4, 24 and 25 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being allegedly unpatentable over *Graham* in view of U.S. Patent No. 5,644,692 (*Eick*).

The undersigned thanks the Examiner for granting the Applicant telephonic-interviews on May 6, 2009 and on May 29, 2009. Pursuant to the Agreement reached with the Examiner during the telephonic-interview on May 29, 2009, and solely to expedite prosecution, independent claims have been amended to recite: *displaying a plurality of horizontal segments of a vertical scroll bar, at least partially based on one or more granulate objects respectively representative of one or more rows of displayed content, wherein each granulate object stores at least (a) a reference count indicative of the relative importance of its respective row and (b) text of its respective row* (see, Figure 8 and pages 11-12 of the present application). The Applicant respectfully reiterates the arguments presented to the Examiner and reserves the right to pursue claims of original scope in a Continuation Application.

The substance of the telephonic-interviews is further summarized below.

In the Final Office Action, the Examiner has asserted that *Graham* teaches: displaying of a scroll bar such that each one of a plurality of locations of the scroll bar indicates the relative importance of a plurality of locations in the file with respect to one another (Final Office Action, pages 3-4, citing col. 4, lines 24-43 and figure 1A of *Graham*).

However, contrary to the Examiner's assertion, it is respectfully submitted that the annotation contour 101 of *Graham* is not *a scroll bar with a plurality of locations of the scroll bar indicating the relative importance of locations of a file* within the context of the claimed invention. In other words, although the page pointer 102 of *Graham* can be dragged to a location on a graphical representation of the document content 104, the page pointer 102 does not in itself indicate the relative importance of the locations of the file. Accordingly, it is respectfully submitted that the Examiner's rejection is improper and should be withdrawn. Moreover, it is respectfully submitted that *Graham* does not teach or suggest this claimed feature, and claim 1 and other independent claims are therefore patentable over *Graham*.

In fact, *Graham* clearly teaches using a combination of a scroll bar (704) and a page pointer (714) in a contour of annotation as depicted in Figure 7A. As such, it is respectfully submitted that *Graham* teaches away from a scroll bar that in itself can indicate the relative importance of locations of a document. Therefore, it is respectfully submitted that *Graham* cannot possibly be combined with another reference to teach the feature recited in claim 1.

It should be noted that claim 1 recites features that render it patentable over the *cited art* for additional reasons. For example, claim 1 recites that *the scroll bar includes a plurality of horizontal segments indicating the relative importance of content of a file.*

It is noted that *Eick* teaches a scroll bar (1311) with horizontal line representations (or text lines 517). However, it is respectfully submitted that *Eick* does not teach or suggest: *horizontal segments indicating the relative importance of content.*

Moreover, it is respectfully submitted that the *cited art* does not teach or suggest this claimed feature and claim 1 is therefore patentable over the *cited art* for this additional reason. Therefore, the Applicant reserves the right to pursue claims of original scope in a continuation.

Nevertheless, claims have been amended because agreement was reached with the Examiner that the *cited art* does not teach or suggest: *displaying a plurality of horizontal segments of a vertical scroll bar, at least partially based on one or more granulate objects respectively representative of one or more rows of displayed content, wherein each granulate object stores at least (a) a reference count indicative of the relative importance of its respective row and (b) text of its respective row* (see, Figure 8 and pages 11-12 of the present application).

Based on the foregoing, it is submitted that the claims are patentably distinct over the cited art of record. Additional limitations recited in the independent claims or the dependent claims are not further discussed because the limitations discussed above are sufficient to distinguish the claimed invention from the cited art. Accordingly, Applicant believes that all pending claims are allowable and respectfully requests a Notice of Allowance for this application from the Examiner.

Applicant hereby petitions for an extension of time which may be required to maintain the pendency of this case, and any required fee for such extension or any further fee required in connection with the filing of this Amendment is to be charged to Deposit Account No. 504481 (Order No. APL1P301). Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the undersigned can be reached at the telephone number set out below.

Respectfully submitted,
BEYER LAW GROUP LLP

/RMahboubian/
Ramin Mahboubian
Reg. No. 44,890

P.O. Box 1687
Cupertino, CA 95015-1687
408-255-8001